

HABITAT

VOLUME IX
NUMBER 1 and 2

HABITAT, a bimonthly publication of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, is listed in the Canadian Periodical Index and authorized as second class matter by the Post Office Department and for payment of postage in cash. Opinions expressed by the authors are not necessarily those of CMHC. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, H. R. B. MacInnes.

CONTENTS — JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH, APRIL/66

- 2 BOUCHERVILLE PART II *Stuart Wilson*
- 14 INTEGRATION OR ISOLATION . . . *Sylvia Goldblatt*
- 24 YOU TAKE THE HIGH ROAD AND I'LL
TAKE THE STREET *Aryeh Cooperstock*
- 32 CINÉMA 1920-1966 *W. E. Minton*
- 36 THE EATON STORY

FRONT COVER: *By-ward Market by Phyllis Lee*

INSIDE FRONT COVER: *A silhouette of Indians fishing
on the Hay River — N.F.B.*

There is not nearly enough professional staff to meet the planning and other needs of those urban centers in Canada that wish to undertake renewal. There is a desperate dearth of trained competent planners, architects, geographers, sociologists, economists and all those who must play an essential role in urban growth and development — people trained to deal not only with large issues, but with small-scale, local and human situations.

Because of our concern over the shortage of trained personnel in the planning field, CMHC has authorized Professor Gerald Hodge of the Division of Town and Regional Planning, University of Toronto, to undertake a study to locate the critical gaps in government, municipal and consultant staffs and determine what skills are required to fill these needs.

It will examine trends in the demand for personnel, in relation to their effect on university and other training programs, and on the future of Canadian urban development.

Professor Hodge is a well-known researcher on the subject of planning in Canada, and will carry out the study in close association with members of CMHC's Advisory Group involved in planning.



INTEGRATION OR ISOLATION

by Sylvia Goldblatt



Scarlettwood Public Housing Project.

Canada has been described as “the last nation in the Western world to adopt subsidized public housing as a national measure”.¹

Federal housing legislation was on the books as early as 1938. Yet it has taken almost 30 years for the leadership, organization and public support to emerge that would make a program of public housing — on a meaningful scale — a social and physical reality.

This study examines the problem of integrating public housing residents with their neighbors outside the project. The basic assumption is that one measure of integration is the extent of joint use of facilities by public housing residents and their neighbors. It is this joint use of facilities that can provide a sense of identification with the community and an opportunity for a shared experience that leads to stronger inter-personal relationships.

Two public housing developments, built in the suburbs of Metropolitan Toronto in the early 1960's, are examined as a study in contrasts.

Scarlettwood, built in upper middle class suburban

The following article prepared especially for Habitat by Miss Goldblatt (Mrs. A. Murray) is taken from a study of two public housing projects in Suburban Toronto. The study undertaken with a grant from CMHC was the basis for Miss Goldblatt's Master of Social Work Thesis at the University of Toronto.

Etobicoke on the western outskirts of Toronto, is a small 150-unit project that might be said to meet the demands of those who say: “Don't concentrate large numbers of low-income families together as the segregated poor — scatter them among those with a higher economic and social standard of living so that the poor can benefit from a contact with those whose aspirations and achievements can be a source of inspiration”. The second project, by contrast, is twice the size — 347 units — and it was built in an area where the income of the neighbours outside the development is very close to that of the residents within it. This project is known as Warden Woods and is located in the suburb of Scarborough on the eastern outskirts of Toronto.

FACTORS INFLUENCING INTEGRATION

Before reviewing the extent to which facilities were jointly used, six influential factors that affect integration are examined. These include: physical barriers; environmental differences; family size and structure; family income and rent; length of residence; and political rapport.

PHYSICAL BARRIERS

Both projects were set down in isolated corners of their municipalities, separated from immediate contact with the rest of the community by a ravine or river and by major traffic arteries. Such barriers make it costly to provide services to a small population, whether it be bus transportation, shopping, recreation or social services.

As one public administrator put it:

“How can we give them recreation services when older areas in the municipality have been waiting for these services for many years and still haven't got them?”

A private agency administrator remarked:

“Staff find it hard to reach the project because transportation from here is awkward and so time-consuming.”

¹P. E. H. Brady, *Relating Public Housing Abroad to Canadian Public Housing*, Toronto: Metropolitan Housing Authority, 1962, p. 38.



Warden Wood Public Housing Project like Scarlettwood is isolated by natural barriers and by poor and expensive bus service to community facilities.

ENVIRONMENTAL DIFFERENCES

Both projects are largely composed of row housing — a design that does not exist in the immediate neighborhood of either area. It makes them conspicuously different from the neighborhood. The predominance of a quadrangle pattern of streets within each project forms another contrast with their respective neighborhoods. Density of child population and an architectural design

which turns the projects in on themselves add to a sense of separateness.

One tenant said Scarlettwood looked like an army barracks from the adjoining thoroughfare. A worker in the same project said of the tenants:

“Scarlettwood depresses me — the buildings, the attitude of the people. They know they haven’t the services they need. They are trying to get an organization going but there’s a problem of apathy that stems from economic deprivation. They see themselves as always wanting to get out and get a place of their own. They don’t really care about the project, except in a very few cases.”

The number of single-parent families adds a disrupting element to the environment, community leaders suggested, because of the special problems of child rearing, moral behavior and lack of incentive among those families.

“The absence of parental authority results in these children being in court,” one leader noted. “It’s a whole community of people without a recognized authority in the person of a father.”

(Note: Because the sample studied in this research was made up of families in which there was a mother and a father in the home, this aspect of the situation was not clearly demonstrated.)

This analysis by community leaders, however, seemed to be confirmed by the attitude of public housing tenants who expressed a strong desire to get out of the projects. They seemed most anxious to get out before their children arrived at teen age. They complained about being lumped with those families who make trouble for the community. They also objected vehemently to the absence of privacy and linked this to the ever-present numbers of children. (There were 143 children in the 30 families interviewed, with 75 per cent of them under the age of 10.) One tenant put it this way:

“People are the same everywhere, but living so close makes it much worse here.”

A social service worker suggested:

“The lack of privacy compounded by the quadrangle design makes it harder to help those who could be helped.”

Another worker commented:

“Those who seem to be able to get the most from our help are those who stay unto themselves — these are the people who only want to stop off here and then get out.”



Some housing in Warden Wood looks out to the street, but in Scarlettwood the residents complain of a lack of privacy because the buildings face inward.



The same worker, however, felt that residents were always making demands for services such as visiting homemakers. "If they would just be neighborly and help each other," she suggested.

Outside each project, attitudes in the neighborhood ranged from virtual ignorance of the project itself to resentment. In the immediate area of Scarlettwood, homeowners were angered by its presence on the grounds that it would devalue their property. Beyond the immediate neighbors, citizens seemed unaware of its existence. The Housing Authority showed its concern for public opinion by maintaining the property in beautiful condition with the aid of a resident caretaker, assisted by two non-resident grounds-keepers.

Near the Warden Woods project, resentment voiced by homeowners could be traced to another factor. The

houses in the project, in some cases, are an improvement over those to be found in the immediate neighborhood, — incomes of project residents and neighbors are relatively close. Hence the neighbors feel that those in the project are being handed something on a silver platter that they had to work for all their lives. It is difficult to find support in the surrounding community for meeting the special needs of public housing families. Efforts to provide a nursery school for children living in the project's high-rise apartment block were bitterly opposed. There is no resident grounds-keeper in Warden Woods.

FAMILY SIZE AND STRUCTURE

The number and ages of children in a family will have a decided influence on how they use shops, recreation and transportation facilities. In this sample, 80 per cent of

the families had at least four children — some had as many as nine. As mentioned above, at least 75 per cent of the children in these families are under the age of 10. A mother with four children under the age of five will find it difficult to shop under the best of circumstances. When the stores are not within walking distance the problem is compounded. To send five children swimming, at 25 cents per child plus transportation charges, is a costly undertaking.

Every family with young children knows that the cost and availability of baby sitters is a real problem. For the low-income family it is a most conspicuous hurdle to integration.

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Although the length of time a family has lived in an area might be considered the key element in their use of available facilities, this did not prove to be the case. Eighty per cent of the families interviewed had lived in the projects for more than a year. But their adaptability, their willingness and capacity to reach out, seemed to determine the use they made of existing facilities rather than their length of residence.

FAMILY INCOME AND RENT

For the family with insecure work opportunities a great attraction for them in public housing is that their rent is reduced when earnings go down. Even if they have to go on welfare, they still have a decent house in which to raise their family. This fact notwithstanding, Mr. P. E. H. Brady wrote in 1962:

“The rent to income ratio in Canadian public housing operations suggests that too high a proportion of income is being directed towards rent.”¹

Today (1966) families earning \$5,000 annually pay as high as 31% of their earnings for rent in public housing, an Ontario Housing Corporation official pointed out. For the large family in particular this leaves very little to spend on activities that would contribute to integration. It also makes it impossible to save enough to buy a house.

The respondents were in general agreement that a major cause of friction within the project was the subject of reporting income and its relation to rent. One of the choicest topics of gossip conversation is that Mrs. W. has taken a job without telling the housing authority. If she tells the housing authority, her earnings are calculated as part of the family income and the rent goes up.

¹Brady, op. cit., p. 16.

It might be that Mr. W. is moonlighting without telling the authority, and for the same reason. One family whose bags were packed to move to a house they had bought, admitted that the only way they had managed to save enough for a down payment was for the husband to work as much extra time as he could get and for his wife to take a job. They did not report this extra earning to the authorities.

“I know that was cheating but I figured that if I could save enough for a down payment on a house, then some other family would be able to take over this one. I could never have saved if I had had to pay the increased rent on what we earned.”

POLITICAL RAPPORT

There was no sign that any rapport had been established between the tenants and their political representatives similar to what has been observed among low-income families in the center of the city. No one seemed to consider their alderman as a logical person to approach with complaints or demands. One woman said: “If we talked to our local alderman, they’d kick us out.” When asked if they go out to vote, respondents replied:

“The municipal and provincial elections, I didn’t vote because the polling booth was too far away. For the federal elections it was in the caretaker’s apartment and I voted.”

The political representatives interviewed indicated they have little or no contact with the residents in the public housing projects. More than one made it clear that “we would never have had public housing in our municipality if it had not been rammed down our throats by Metro” (metropolitan government). They objected to “putting them all together”.

The atmosphere in public housing is “too much like an institution”, another politician complained. They were very critical of higher levels of government for building public housing projects without agreeing to finance the services needed to help a group of low-income families.

“Put one or two of them on a street, so if they are in trouble there aren’t too many for the neighbors to be able to help them.”

JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

As noted in the introduction, one measure of integration for public housing residents with their neighbors outside the project, is joint use of facilities. The six facilities examined were: health; recreation; transportation; shopping; education; churches.



HEALTH

Because so many of the families in this study were protected by some form of medical insurance through the husband's place of employment, there was little opportunity to observe problems of medical deprivation among low-income families. But a school official made the observation that:

"There are many project children who are not getting the medical care they need because the families without medical insurance avoid using a doctor they cannot afford."

Both of these housing projects are a considerable distance from hospital clinics, well-baby clinics or public medical services of any description. Some hint of what this meant to families without medical insurance came out during interviews when reference was made to less fortunate families or when the respondent did not have coverage.

It was in the area of dental and eye care that everyone seemed to be in the most trouble. There are no dental clinics for low-income families in either Etobicoke or Scarborough. The notes that are sent home with a child from the public health people at the school are just ignored:

"There's just no money for it — 'though we've been told the kids need it."

The word dentist brought forth responses like: "Forget it"; "Hate to think about it"; "It's out of the question".

Auxiliary services were in short supply in both projects. The health and welfare workers made it clear:

"They desperately need more services." Lack of psychological services for children and adults is a constant source of frustration to those who are seeking or giving health services.

The opportunity for integration of public housing tenants through health and welfare services in either area, is very limited.

RECREATION

Both Etobicoke Township and Scarborough Township operate their recreation services on the principle that

"no one gets something for nothing; people only appreciate something if they have to pay for it".

But in discussions with township officials who feel very strongly about "the right of every individual to constructive leisure-time activity", there was a degree of acknowledgement that the pay-your-own-way policy was as much a financial necessity as a statement of principle.

The fact that the City of Toronto offers free swimming lessons in the schools, free outdoor pools, free artificial rinks in the winter, et cetera, may have been a political decision at the time it was introduced — as one suburban leader suggested — but it also made it possible for everyone to enjoy these facilities regardless of income.

The result of the suburban recreation policy is that only playground programs are free. In the field of youth services fees cover a portion of the cost, adult programs must be self-sustaining. This puts a drastic curb on the joint use of recreation facilities by low-income public housing residents and their neighbors outside



The income of the people living in the neighborhood is not much greater than those in the Warden Wood. This creates some resentment because of the better housing and the subsidized rental in the Public Housing Project. The middle-income residents in the neighborhood of Scarlettwood seem unaware of the project in their area.



The beautifully landscaped grounds of Scarlettwood restrict the children's play.

the development.

A 25 cent fee for swimming at a local high school becomes a layout of almost two dollars for a family with four children who must be given transportation to the school. One mother explained that she had saved three dollars in order to give one of her children swimming lessons at the school during the summer. When an emergency drained off the three dollars, the swimming lessons had to be forgotten. As one administrator put it:

"Low-income families live so close to economic disaster that it takes very little to tip the balance of security."

Free recreation services on a limited scale are provided by a few local churches. Parents spoke warmly of this effort. "They even come and pick our kids up once a week because it's too far for them to go on their own," one Scarlettwood family explained.

In the field of adult services, recreation facilities were either non-existent or out of the financial reach of project residents. Watching T.V. seemed to be the main recreational activity.

Some of the men had hobbies or some activity through their jobs, but the women described little recreation activity for themselves. The exception was in Scarlettwood where the Y.W.C.A. offers a program for both homebound and working mothers that ranges from crafts and calisthenics to discussion groups and films. One participant explained "the 'Y' is so nice they won't take the 25 cents from you if you haven't got it".

In the development of recreation programs the role of leadership seems crucial. Many administrators and community leaders made it clear that low-income families lack the "know-how" for volunteer leadership. There also has to be some stability of tenancy to provide time for development of this "know-how".

In Scarlettwood, an 18 year old boy has given leadership in the formation of a Scarlettwood Youth Organization that embraces young people in the project and the neighborhood. The Municipal Recreation Department in this area has helped stage a number of successful dances in the community arena. Neighborhood parents, in an effort to segregate the project residents, attempted to get the Recreation Department to form two separate groups; the attempt was unsuccessful.

Warden Woods' teenagers have had no leadership. More than one authority spoke of neighborhood gangs which include teenagers from Warden Woods. One

educator described them as "depressingly similar to the gang picture in large American cities".

TRANSPORTATION

In view of the fact that these two projects are so far from existing facilities, transportation is a vital service. About half the families have cars, but for those without a car the place of transportation — particularly for large families — cannot be overemphasized. In addition, suburban residents pay double fare in order to come into the center of the city.

Infrequent weekday service or even total absence on Sundays puts a formidable hurdle in the way of families wishing to use public parks, shopping facilities, recreation facilities or even a visit to friends and relatives.

SHOPPING

For both developments large scale shopping cannot be done in the immediate vicinity. Scarlettwood residents do have shops within a short walk from their homes, but only a few food items can be purchased. A small shopping plaza is planned for the Warden Woods project.

If they have a car some families return to their old place of residence to do shopping. One housewife pointed out that when she lived close to the stores in the heart of the city she could visit them more frequently and take advantage of the sales. Some said they used rummage sales or the Crippled Civilians Store to shop for their children's clothes. There were many families who had always shopped in the large department stores and continued to do so.

Some families had met the food shopping problem by buying freezers together with a frozen food service — which they could ill afford.

EDUCATION

Unlike other areas where joint use of facilities is often optional, education has a built-in requirement for such use. Obligatory school attendance between the ages of five and 16 means that children of public housing residents and their neighbors are mingled throughout the elementary and secondary school system.

At the schools serving both projects, children of public housing residents tend to transport the problems of troubled families to the classroom.

How the school system copes with this influx seems keyed to the proportion of project children in the school itself. In Westmount Public School which serves the Scarlettwood project, there is one Scarlettwood child for every three from the surrounding area. In Warden

Avenue Public School, there is one public housing child to every neighborhood child.

At Westmount School — an architecturally charming building 20 minutes by foot away from the Scarlettwood project — the teachers' initial reaction to project children was to separate them from the neighborhood ones in their minds, but this attitude was altered in time. The initial tendency of school authorities to split project children from the others stemmed logically from the problems they presented. Teachers had to learn how to handle children with an inordinately short interest span.

"Even by Grade III some of these children have been in eight different schools."

Teachers found an unfamiliar set of behavior problems. They encountered children with stories of events on the home front which had a disrupting influence; father in jail, common-law relationships, several children in one family with different fathers.

But within a year's time school personnel at Westmount spoke of project children learning to conform to the behavior patterns of the rest of the school population:

"They no longer spit, for example, because our kids don't spit."

Westmount School has tried to meet the special learning problems some children have. Additional teachers are being taken on staff in order to permit them to work with smaller groups of students.

"Although students may show the same I.Q. in testing, other factors influence their capacity to learn."

There are classes for the 'gifted child' and for the 'slow learner'. Out of the four 'gifted children' in the school two were children from the project and two from the neighborhood. Of the 12 children in the 'opportunity class', 10 are from Scarlettwood and two from the neighborhood.

An educator made the observation that the public housing students and those of the neighborhood will never completely integrate because the aspirations of the parents for their children are different. The neighborhood parent is largely from the business community and has had a high school education. His ambition is to see his children go to university. The public housing parent is largely an unskilled worker with a public school education. The most he expects to see his child achieve is a high school education.

The parents of children from Scarlettwood have no opportunity to integrate through a Home and School organization since it does not exist in Westmount School.

Warden Avenue public school was expanded to twice its original size in order to accommodate children from the Warden Woods project. The school adjoins the housing development property and has one public housing child for every neighborhood child. Because of its proximity to the project the school seems to be the first point of reference for troubled families. School personnel said:

"We need the services of a full-time social worker . . . we should be devoting our time to educational duties for which we were trained . . . instead we're doing social work for which we are not trained."

". . . sometimes the children arrive at school in the winter inadequately clothed or in a very neglected condition . . . sometimes the children are mistreated at home. To compound the situation, there is so much turnover among the tenants, it means new problems are constantly arriving."

Before the school was expanded, they explained, "we could cope with some of our own families who needed help . . . there were seldom more than eight or 10 families." Now, there are so many families in need of help "the school doesn't know where to turn for all the help they need".

The staff at Warden Avenue School was given an additional vice-principal in order to offset the burden of work created by the public housing population. More help is needed from community social services, the writer was told. What is needed is: "some kind of center where they could find social work help".

The school hears complaints from families in the project and in the neighborhood, who are working hard to give their children a standard of behavior and feel themselves undermined by families who are unable to discipline their children. The disorganized families pay no attention to notes and reports sent home by the school.

There is an active Home and School organization in Warden Avenue School. Some residents claimed they felt snubbed when they went to meetings. Others denied this vehemently and said they were "treated like everybody else". One active leader from the neighborhood complained of the lack of "know how" among project residents:

"You ask them if they want help with a job they agree to do and it's refused but when the time comes nothing gets done."

Her other major annoyance was based on the fact that "they seem to always want something for nothing". She

described the reluctance displayed by project people, for paying their way into a school concert or leaving left-over cookies for the teachers' staff room.

The educational aspirations of parents in the Warden Woods project and in the neighborhood seem to be directed no higher than the high school level. Educators were in general agreement that any increased opportunity that might be offered inside the project would be equally useful and important to neighborhood children, i.e. a nursery school.

CHURCHES

For some public housing families the church is the one avenue for integration with their neighbors outside the project. In neither of these developments would the number be large. The link in most cases is with the small, evangelical churches; the larger churches play a limited role. Some churches send cars to the project to pick up children who want to go to Sunday School or adults who want to attend services.

In Scarlettwood, the warmest praise was directed toward the Gospel Church that gave the project children a hobby class one night a week and an opportunity to go to camp for 10 days in the summer. A clergyman from one of the well-established churches said he was sure that most of his congregation were unaware that this little public housing project existed.

In Warden Woods, the Mennonite Church has tried to offer help wherever possible. The Church has a piece of property very close to the development on which they are eager to build a facility that could be helpful to the low-income families in the project.

In both the east and west-end communities the clergy acknowledged a feeling of helplessness when called upon to assist families suffering from a multitude of social problems. As one neighbor put it: "Even the clergy, they don't know what to do". She was referring to a family with a drinking problem where there was a lot of difficulty disciplining the children. One clergyman said he thought "the single-parent families have the worst time of it".

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of this inquiry joint use of facilities is not related to whether a public housing project is situated near a high or a low income area. Neither community consciously worked at providing facilities that could be used by both those living in the projects and their neighbors outside the projects. The one exception might

be the schools. Joint use of facilities is unlikely to materialize unless this is an objective identified as part of the overall purpose for which public housing is designed.

Alvin L. Schorr makes this point in his book "Slums and Social Insecurity":

"Public housing is pressed, if it is going to serve families with any precision, to define its objectives and to alter policies to further these objectives. At least three choices are open:

- (1) a real estate operation for the respectable poor — the purely poor,
- (2) a rehabilitative program for the seriously dependent and troubled poor,
- (3) a greatly enlarged and altered program, at least in part deinstitutionalized with a variety of kinds of housing opportunities.

In the absence of a settled decision to seek the third course of (deinstitutionalized housing with a variety of kinds of housing opportunities) . . . local housing authorities are moving slowly, in most cases with pronounced reluctance, toward rehabilitative programs. Under present circumstances the families who are entering public housing make such a course inevitable . . . the families are isolated and segregated . . . many receive public assistance . . . many are broken families. They cannot be abandoned to their problems; they must be served. Moreover, when they are not served, buildings deteriorate, delinquencies occur, and deprived youngsters grow into disabled adults. It becomes plain that neglect is expensive."¹

These remarks may provide some insight into why there is such reluctance on the part of the general public to accept public housing tenants into their midst. If in fact the housing authorities are failing to diagnose "with precision" the needs of families who are placed in public housing, then there is no way of determining and providing the help they need. Consequently the member of the public who happens to find himself living beside a "seriously dependent and troubled" family is left to cope with the discomfiting behavior of this family. No one would expect a healthy family to cope with another physically ill family; perhaps it is unreasonable to ask the healthy family to cope with the socially ill family.

The potential for integrating public housing families with neighbors outside the development, is closely related to the variety of poverty from which the families suffer. The self-respecting "respectable poor" may well fit into "deinstitutionalized" housing and become integrated with

¹Alvin L. Schorr, *Slums and Social Insecurity*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Social Security Administration Division of Research and Statistics. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, p. 115.

very little community help beyond the provision of decent accommodation at a price they can afford. "A rehabilitative program for the seriously dependent and troubled poor" cannot be undertaken by neighbors. It must be an integral part of a total public housing service planned and carried out by the community.

If integration of public housing tenants and neighbors is to be one objective of a program for adequately housing low-income families, then observations in this study lead to the following conclusions:

- (1) Housing should be designed so as to blend it with neighborhood housing.
- (2) Street patterns within the development should help to direct residents out toward the neighborhood rather than in on themselves.
- (3) Density of child population — particularly in the under 10 year old age group — should be planned for in such a way as to reduce tension due to lack of privacy. Provision of a facility i.e. day care center and/or nursery school for use by residents and neighbors could contribute to integration.
- (4) Provision should be made for a family service center within the project or very close to it. By making the center available for use by tenants and their neighbors outside the project an increased sense of community is possible.

The precise nature of this facility would be influenced by what services are already available. It seems advisable to this writer to place the emphasis on a health and education program. Health services might include: a well-baby clinic, pre- and post-natal clinic, well-equipped dental service, mental health clinic for all ages including family therapy and social service counselling. Education services might include: nursery school and day-care, after school programs for children who need help with homework, family life education programs for various age groups in the family including parents and grandparents. A service that would give guidance for both paid and voluntary work.

- (5) The locating of public housing projects in less isolated places would reduce the high cost per capita of providing services such as transportation; recreation and shopping. Municipalities would be able to encourage integration by keeping these services within the financial reach of low-income families.

- (6) Responsibility, for developing the leadership potential among public housing tenants, must be accepted as an appropriate community service.

- (7) Public housing must be seen as one part of the total welfare picture. Decent housing is a basic service for those who cannot afford it on the commercial market.

However, low-income families who are "sick families" —those with serious emotional and social problems — cannot integrate unless they are helped to function as "healthy families". Good housing is crucial, but alone it will not serve this end.

Public housing might be used the way we use a hospital. Some patients require a place to rest and with a minimum of care they will return to society in good health. Some patients require intensive care if they are to recover. This means making available all the skill and knowledge of medical science. There is always the reality to be faced that some patients cannot recover no matter what is done for them. This is not to say that any effort should be spared to give them what help is available.

Out of enlightened self-interest, if not for humanitarian reasons, society must see public housing as an opportunity to serve the economically undernourished. The diseases that spring from neglect of this group are too obvious: anti-social behavior; mental break-down and the perpetuation of poverty. If integration of these low-income families is to be one of the goals of our public housing program, the concept of the "Therapeutic Community" might be usefully adopted. It was developed in the post-war years to help mental patients avoid a sense of isolation from those who enjoy good health. They are given every opportunity to make use of the health that can be extended to them by the more fortunate both inside and outside the hospital. Both the literature and the writer's research support the assumption that isolation — physical or social — is harmful to the task of integrating low-income families in the community.

There is a challenge to public housing planners and to all who would help the low-income family to diagnose its needs and work towards meeting them. By now it is well known that in the central city, where there is a concentration of low-income families, there has been an insufficient supply of needed services and this shortage is even more pronounced in the more recently developed communities which came into existence in the post-war era. The physical and social isolation of the new suburban communities, combined with their incapacity and/or unwillingness to cope with the special needs of low-income families, creates, unsurmountable hurdles to integration, through joint use of facilities, for the public housing resident. It is this inaccessibility of services that creates the major problems of integration, rather than the differences or similarity of income between the residents and their neighbors.